

REMARKS

Claims 1, 19, and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter that Applicants regard as their invention. In particular, the Examiner indicated that he does not understand what is meant by the phrase, "the state of references by a user to Web sites." Therefore, Applicants have amended claim 1, for example, to replace the phrase with, "the state of user references to Web sites." Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,933,604 (Inakoshi). Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified claims of the present invention are not anticipated by Inakoshi, as Inakoshi does not teach each and every element of the claims.

Applicants have amended claim 1, for example, to include the recitation, "said updating including deleting from and adding to the contents of said address list according to the state of user references wherein said deleting occurs based on inaccessibility of a webpage."

Applicants respectfully submit that Inakoshi fails to disclose an updating section that deletes from or adds to the contents of an address list according to the state of user references, as recited by currently amended claim 1, for example. In Inakoshi, an output means outputs change information pertaining to a state of a resource. The output means is not an updating section that *updates the contents of an address list*. There is no address list in Inakoshi. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Inakoshi, as Inakoshi does not teach the above-identified feature of the claims. As claim 2 depends from claim 1, claim 2 is patentable over the reference for at least the reason offered above with respect to claim 1. As claims 19 and 20 recite language similar to that of claim 1, claims 19 and 20 are patentable over Inakoshi for at least the reasons presented above for claim 1.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,055,570 (Nielsen). Nielsen is directed to a method for providing automatic notification of sufficient changes in bookmarked information files. Users of information access programs such as World Wide Web (WWW) browsers can be automatically informed of changes in information files, for example, WWW pages, when the

information file maintainer determines that a sufficient change has been made to the file. See Nielsen, column 4, lines 12-38.

The above-identified claims of the present invention are patentable over Nielsen, as Nielsen does not disclose the above-identified feature, as recited in the claims of the present invention. Nielsen merely receives a notification message that provides notice that a particular web page, for example, has changed. Nielsen does not update or change information. It merely provides notification indicating when the information has changed.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Nielsen, as Nielsen does not teach the above-identified feature of the claims. As claim 2 depends from claim 1, claim 2 is patentable over the reference for at least the reason offered above with respect to claim 1. As claims 19 and 20 recite language similar to that of claim 1, claims 19 and 20 are patentable over Nielsen for at least the reasons presented above for claim 1.

On page 5, claims 3-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inakoshi in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,631,496 (Li). Applicants respectfully submit that Li does not teach or suggest, "said updating including deleting from and adding to the contents of said address list according to the state of user references wherein said deleting occurs based on inaccessibility of a website. . .," as recited by currently amended claim 1. Although Li discloses that a bookmark system automatically creates a bookmark for a user or for the system when a document is accessed at a high enough frequency over a period of time, it does not teach an updating section that both deletes from and adds to the contents of an address list according to the state of user references. See Li, column 2, lines 36-45.

On page 8, claims 3-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen in view of Li. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Nielsen of the above-identified feature of currently amended claim 1, as Nielsen merely receives a notification message indicating when information has changed. Regarding Li, the reference does not disclose or suggest, "said updating including deleting from and adding to the contents of said address list according to the state of user references wherein said deleting occurs based on inaccessibility of a website." Although Li discloses that a user can specify a criterion for automated removal of inactive bookmarks, the bookmarks in Li are removed based on a date a webpage corresponding to the bookmark was visited. See Li, column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 3. Therefore, neither Nielsen nor Li, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the

above-identified feature of our proposed claim 1. As claims 3-18 depend from independent claim 1, these claims are patentable over the references, for at least the reason offered above with respect to claim 1.

In view of the above Remarks, Applicants believe that all of the claims of the present invention are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that the prosecution of the application could be advanced through a telephone conversation, then the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned. Favorable action in this regard is earnestly solicited.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the USPTO is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 26 July 05

By: 
Reginald D. Lucas
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501